



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,618	01/29/2004	Chen-Hsiung Cheng	9432-158DVB	5657

27572 7590 12/29/2006
HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

ABOAGYE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/29/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,618

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Aboagye

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 and 24-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 and 24-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 24- 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 24-27 contain the new matter limitations "wherein a maximum tool pitch is less than fifty percent of average spot size; wherein the maximum tool pitch is no more than forty percent of average spot size; wherein the maximum tool pitch is no more than thirty percent of average spot size; wherein the maximum tool pitch is no more than twenty percent of average spot size". There is no support for these limitations in the disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 11, 12, 15-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,231,566).

Lai teaches a laser ablating system "100" comprising: a laser source "10", a beam shaping optics "20", a scanner "40" made up of galvanometer scan mirrors, and a computer or tool path control module "50". Said laser ablation system operable to determine a tool path for ablating a layer of material from an exposed surface of a workpiece (cornea) with laser (see, column 4, lines 17-41); wherein the tool path describes a substantially constant arc speed (see, column 2, lines 3- 35); a plurality of lasers (see, column 4, lines 8-16) controlled by said tool path control module to perform ablation of a plurality of workpieces according to the tool path, and wherein said tool path module is operable to formulate a radius and a local angular speed (see, column 4, lines 8-41, figures 1 and 3-5). Lai teaches spiral scanning operation for generating rings wherein the diameter of said rings vary from layer to layer (column 2, lines 25-35). Lai

Art Unit: 1725

also teaches a computer program interfaced with the scanner such that both uniform and non-uniform scan path can be generated depending on the degree of tuning (column 3, lines 29-40; column 3, line 65-column 4, line 7; and column 5, lines 38-65). The examiner interprets this as a capability of executing a tool path with a non-uniform radius and angular progression.

Regarding claims 16-19, Lai laser ablating system is operable to ablate or remove successive layers of corneas; wherein each of the corneas is composed of substantially identical material and has substantially identical geometric characteristics and each of the multiple regions the corneas are composed of substantially identical material and has substantially identical geometric characteristics (see, column 1 lines 14-20, column 5, lines 7-33).

Regarding claim 28, Lai, teaches progressive tool path executed at constant repletion rate (column 2, lines 39-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants invention was made to have used the system of Lai to generated laser tool path of non-uniformly changing radius since the system can be tuned to describe variations of scanning schemes by using the computer program interfaced with the scanner (column 3, lines 34-40 and column 4, lines 17-26).

6. Claims 13, 14 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,231,566) in view of Cutler et al. (US 5,798,927).

Lai further teaches a system operable to vary the scan speed according to the radius of the tool path (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 6); a beam shaping optical

Art Unit: 1725

assembly or module operable in controlling the spot size based on the tool pitch or the pulse rate based of lasers (column 3, lines 29-50). It is noted that with such a system capability, the tool pitch or the pulse rate can be optimized to achieve variations of spot sizes. Lai does not expressly teach PZT scan mirror in his disclosed system.

However, Cutler et al. teaches a laser milling system for performing tool path operation using a piezoelectric transducer as a scanning device which is operable controls the repetition rate and the spot size and positioning by variation of the applied voltage across it (see, Cutler et al., column 10, lines 27-41, and figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to have modified the system of Lai by using a PZT scanner as taught by Cutler et al., wherein doing so would have meant, substituting one form of positioning device for another in the same art which would have enabled the appropriate setting of tool pitch for a preferred spot size base on applied voltage per revolution (see, Cutler et al., column 10, lines 27-41).

Response to Arguments

7. The examiner acknowledges the applicants' amendment received by USPTO on December 06, 2006. Claims 11-19 and 24-28 are currently under consideration in the application.

8. Applicant's arguments filed December 06, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to applicant's argument that Lai only teaches "The diameters of the rings are uniformly increased or decreased in each layer", it is noted

Art Unit: 1725

that Lai teaches spiral scanning operation generating rings with variation in the diameter of the rings from layer to layer (column 2, lines 25-35). Lai teaches a computer program interfaced with the scanner which can be tuned by the operator to execute either uniform or non-uniform diameter rings (column 3, lines 29-40; column 3, line 65-column 4, line 7; and column 5, lines 38-65). It is therefore noted that the system of Lai is capable of executing both uniform and non-uniform progressive tool path, thereby describing trajectories of changing radius during successive scan operations. Claims 11, 12, 15-19 and 28 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Lai, claims 13, 14 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by the combination of Lai and Cutler et al. and claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as having issues of new matter.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1725

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Aboagye whose telephone number is 571-272-8165. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AM
AM

KEVIN KERNS
PRIMARY EXAMINER


Michael Aboagye
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 1725

12/22/2006

Kevin Kerns 12/22/06